



Docket No. NE297-PCT(US)
TAK.049

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

Takanori SHIMIZU, et al.

Serial No.: 10/511,630

Group Art Unit: 2883

Filed: October 19, 2004

Examiner: Chiem, Dinh D.

For: OPTOELECTRONIC HYBRID INTEGRATED MODULE AND LIGHT
INPUT/OUTPUT APPARATUS HAVING THE SAME AS COMPONENT

Honorable Commissioner of Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

PETITION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.181
TO ENTER AMENDMENT

Sir:

Applicants herein petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.181 for entrance of the Amendment filed on November 30, 2005, in the above-referenced Application.

Examiner issued an Office communication, dated February 28, 2006, alleging that the Amendment was not fully responsive to the Office Action dated August 31, 2005.

The Examiner alleges, "that there are no claims drawn to the originally elected invention" (see Office communication dated February 28, 2006). Specifically, the Examiner alleges that "the current amended independent claims 1 and 12 are reciting a flip-chip mounting directly to the transparent base material surface, which is limited to the structure of Figures 1-6, non-elected by action on the merits" (see Office communication dated February 28, 2006). Applicants respectfully disagree.

PETITION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.181 TO ENTER AMENDMENT
U.S. Application Serial No. 10/511,630

That is, Applicants point out that the Examiner has not issued a Restriction Requirement in the Application. Furthermore, Applicants have not elected any of Figures 1-8 in the Application, because Applicants have not been presented with an Election of Species of Requirement.

The Examiner relies upon M.P.E.P. §§ 818.01 and 818.02(a) to support his erroneous allegations. However, the Examiner has failed to consider M.P.E.P. §818, which defines an election as “the designation of the particular one of two or more disclosed inventions that will be prosecuted in the application”. No such designation has been made because, as indicated above, the Examiner has not issued a Restriction Requirement.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that originally filed claims 1 and 3-12 were generic to the invention depicted in all of Figures 1-8. Therefore, no implied election of certain figures was made by Applicants, as alleged by the Examiner.

Thus, Applicants Amendment filed on November 30, 2005 is fully responsive to the Office Action dated August 31, 2005. Therefore, the Examiner’s allegations contained in the Office communication dated February 28, 2006 are clearly erroneous and without merit.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the Office communication dated February 28, 2006 and to enter and consider the Amendment filed on November 30, 2005.


If the Examiner wishes to maintain this unreasonable objection, Applicants request the Examiner to which features recited in the originally filed claims constituted an election of Figures 7 and 8 of the Application.

PETITION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.181 TO ENTER AMENDMENT
U.S. Application Serial No. 10/511,630

Please charge any deficiencies and/or credit any overpayments necessary to enter this
paper to Attorney's Deposit Account number 50-0481.

Date: March 16, 2026

Respectfully Submitted,



Scott M. Tulino, Esq.
Registration No. 48,317

Seam M. McGinn, Esq.
Registration No. 34,386

MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

LAW GROUP, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Road
Vienna, Virginia 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254